

R E M A R K S

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, because the Amendment places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; does not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration because the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; does not present any additional claims; relates to matters of form rather than substance because the added language was already present in the claims, and places the application in better form for an appeal should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the Amendment, reexamination and further and favorable reconsideration of the subject application in light of the following remarks, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, are thus respectfully requested.

1. Status of the Claims

Prior to the above claim amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-8, 14, 15, 22-25 and 80-100 stand pending. Claims 14, 15, 22-25, and 80 stand withdrawn. Applicants note with appreciation that claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 81-83, and 88-96 stand allowed. Claims 6, 8, 84-87, and 97-100 remain rejected.

With the above amendment, Applicants have canceled claims 6, 8, 84-89, and 97-100 without prejudice of or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter in a divisional or continuation application.

2. Status of the Drawings

Applicants note with appreciation the indication that the drawings filed December 10, 2003, are acceptable.

3. Response to Amendment

Applicants note that the objection to claims 86 and 87 has been withdrawn in light of the previous Amendment. The rejection of claims 5, 88 and 89 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been withdrawn.

Claims 6, 8, 84-87 and 97-100 remain rejected.

4. Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants provided an IDS on April 3, 2007 based on an Office Action and PTO-892 from a related U.S. application; the materials were submitted within 3 months from the mail date of the Office Action (mail date was January 4, 2007) pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(d). Applicants request consideration and return of the PTO-1449 form with the Office's next communication.

5. Obviousness Type Double Patenting Rejection


Claims 6, 8, 84-89, and 97-100 remain rejected under obviousness type double patenting in view of claims 162-166 of U.S. Application No. 10/374,979. Applicants have canceled claims 6, 8, 84-89 and 97-100 without prejudice to or disclaimer of their subject matter. Thus, the double patenting rejection with respect to claims 162-166 of U.S. Application No. 10/374,979 stands mooted. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn. With the withdrawal of the rejection, all the claims stand allowable and should proceed to issue.

CONCLUSION

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding Applicants' amendments or response, she is asked to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at (202) 842-8821. Please direct all correspondence to the below-listed address.

In the event that the Office believes that there are fees outstanding in the above-referenced matter and for purposes of maintaining pendency of the application, the Office is authorized to charge the outstanding fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. The Office is likewise authorized to credit any overpayment to the same Deposit Account Number. In the event that a fee is necessary for Notice of Appeal in order to maintain pendency of this application, this paper will also serve as Notice and authorization to charge the above Deposit Account to maintain pendency.

Respectfully submitted,



Mercedes K. Meyer, Ph.D., Esq.

Registration No. 44,939

DRINKER BIDDEE & REATH LLP

1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100

Washington, D.C. 20005-1209

Date: May 14, 2007